UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/456,806	12/08/1999	YUNG-CHING SHA	SHA-2	6937

7590 08/26/2004	**EXAMINER**
HENRY T BRENDZEL	BLOUNT, STEVEN
BOX 574	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2661	15

SPRINGFIELD, NJ 07081

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKETT NO.

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	17

DATE MAILED:

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) _Mr. Brendzel_   (3) _____

(2) _Mr. Blount_   (4) _____

Date of interview _8/23/04 and 8/24/04_

Type: ☒ Telephonic   ☐ Personal (copy is given to   ☐ applicant   ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes   ☒ No. If yes, brief description: _____

_____

Agreement   ☐ was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question.   ☒ was not reached.

Claims discussed: _____ _1 and 23_

Identification of prior art discussed: _6075767 (Sakamoto et al), 5,870,382 (Tounai et al)_

_____

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _See attachment._

_____

_____

_____

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☒ 1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

☐ 2. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

                                                _8/24/04_

PTOL-413 (REV. 2 -93)   Examiner's Signature

ORIGINAL FOR INSERTION IN RIGHT HAND FLAP OF FILE WRAPPER

In the interview on 8/24/04, with respect to claim 1, Mr. Brendzel pointed out that Sakamoto et al does not teach user specified directives that flow to module 3, or signals flowing from decision logic to the two logic modules (esp. line 13 of claim 1). With respect to claim 23, Mr. Brendzel pointed out Sakamoto et al does not teach user specified directives as before, or comparing bits using a second register, and that there would be no motivation to combine Sakamoto and Tounai. Mr. Blount consulted with a Primary examiner, and on 8/24/04, told Mr. Brendzel that they felt that a reply to the Office action should be made, because they felt that there was an issue concerning the control signal 4, and that with respect to the previously discussed framers (and consequently the portion of claim 1 which states "develops signals that flow to said framer..."), the examiner referred to section C of the Office action. Mr. Brendzel again mentioned the issue concerning motivation to combine with respect to claim 23, and the examiner referred to column 8 lines 23+ of Sakamoto, and col 4 lines 35+ of Tounai.

Attachment